

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent file only

Do not remove.

No. 94

October 2, 1962

1. United Nations
2. Cuba

1. UNITED NATIONS

Comment on the UN General Assembly reflects concern about Russia's intentions, particularly its evident intention to press for a troika-type Secretariat. The end result of the establishment of a three-man directorate "would be a debating society," the Milwaukee Journal warns, "and most debates would end in inaction." Similarly, the New York Times concluded that acceptance of the Soviet formula would lead to "paralysis and civil war inside the Secretariat."

With reference to the Soviet desire to apply the troika principle more broadly, the Catholic weekly, America, says: "Obviously, the Soviets see, or would like to see, the world divided into three camps. At best, they might expect the neutrals...to lean away from the West. At least, they could expect concerted anti-Communist actions to be hamstrung."

According to Roscoe Drummond, Foreign Minister Gromyko's speech indicated that the Kremlin's two purposes are, "to render the UN helpless to keep the peace wherever the Soviet Union wants turmoil," and to propagate the idea that revolution is moral but counter-revolution is immoral.

Russian efforts to interfere with personnel policies of the Secretariat are cited by Lawrence Malkin in The Reporter. "The Russians will hardly need a troika if they can limit and control the activities of the secretariat by other means," he suggests.

Concerned by the recent apprehension of two Russian spies-in-U.N.-clothing, the Philadelphia Inquirer declares that the U.S. "is certainly warranted...in keeping all Red-bloc personnel under constant surveillance, 'immunity' or not." The Inquirer also says: "We...need the U.N., and a stronger U.N. at that, to safeguard such harmony among nations as may be possible."

Sharp criticism of the UN continues to come from a few sources. "It should be reduced to an institution of international discussion and technical cooperation," the National Review Bulletin asserts, adding: "As long as it can be used as a sump to drain off American dollars and to subvert Western interests, it will continue to rot the ramparts of freedom." The Chicago Tribune, critical of new UN members, says: "Its refusal to establish the necessary criteria for membership renders U.N. meaningless and impotent."

Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Today's meeting of the OAS Foreign Ministers sparks considerable interest in the organization's possible role in the Cuban crisis. "We would suppose," says Hearst's New York Journal-American, that the plan for building a Soviet "fishing harbor" in Havana Bay "would emphasize to the ministers--and their nations--the growing danger of a base of international communism in this hemisphere."

The Washington Post suggests that the conferees consider a declaration expressing the American republics' intent "to come to the assistance of any uprising that takes place on Cuban soil against the Soviet occupation." William R. Hearst Jr. hopes "they look with favor on the growing move in Central America to establish a kind of Caribbean NATO to guard against Cuban-based aggression and subversion." The Christian Science Monitor feels that Secretary Rusk is "wise to start trying to build OAS anti-Castro unity on a strictly defensible basis. It is only there that he is likely to succeed."

But some maintain that "little is to be achieved" through OAS by way of coping with Castro (e.g., Chicago Trib., Gould Lincoln, Gerry Robichaud of Chicago News, Clare Boothe Luce). "If we wait for Latin America to rise to this challenge, we will not live that long," argues Scripps-Howard's Washington News. "This is a threat to national security which the U.S. must handle on its own." Sen. Javits (R-N.Y.) urges calling an emergency OAS meeting; and if the organization refuses to act against Castro, he holds the U.S. should immediately organize "a Central American and Caribbean defense organization, pledged and armed" to contain and undermine Castro's power.

Bonn and Ankara are applauded for moving to end merchant shipments of objectionable cargoes to Cuba, in "recognition of NATO's responsibilities" in the Cuban crisis (e.g., N.Y. Herald Trib., Cincinnati Enquirer, Phila. Inquirer). The Christian Science Monitor holds that such actions should "help the more moderate elements in U.S. opinion to control policy as against those groups who think simply in terms of a military crackdown on Castro and whose case may gain converts if America's allies seem content to let the U.S. go it alone in Cuba."

"If they are the friends of the U.S. they profess to be," says the Watertown Times, isn't it time the other NATO states took the same action? John S. Knight asserts that "if they turn us down, we should be less responsive with our favors."

But a few stress that "there are good reasons" why Europe should take a less alarmist view of Cuba. The Monroe Doctrine "is, after all, rather exclusively American dogma," says Crosby Noyes. Joseph C. Harsch thinks the picture "might be different" had the U.S. consistently supported individual allied interests in Suez, the Dutch East Indies, Algeria and other places.

Marguerite Higgins suggests that the U.S., instead of seeking allied help and "fearing its aloneness," adopt the "sensible alternative" of "going it alone in its Cuban policies."